



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,683	10/19/2004	Noboru Yamamoto	121552	4828
25944	7590	12/23/2008	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			NGUYEN, THUONG	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
2455				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/23/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/511,683	YAMAMOTO, NOBORU	
	<b>Examiner</b>	Art Unit	
	Thuong (Tina) T. Nguyen	2455	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thuong (Tina) T. Nguyen. (3) Justin T. Lingard.

(2) \_\_\_\_\_. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 16 December 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 5 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Arakawa (Patent No. 2002/0065793 A1) & Rosner (Patent No. 2004/0221138 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *Discussed claims 5 & 11 and the differences between Rosner reference over the application. Discussed about the claim languages and suggested the amendment to the claim to make the claims more definite. Furhter search and/or consideration will be made after receiving the Remark/Argument.*

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

**THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.** (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/saleh najjar/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2455